EGHN
EUROPEAN GARDEN
HERITAGE NETWORK

Sustainability Appraisal For Gardens Policies

Spatial Garden Policy - A Toolkit

Contents

1 Sustainability Appraisals

2 Background to sustainability in the UK
- Purpose of the SA
- Compliance with SEA Directive/Regulations

3 Appraisal Methodology

4 Sustainability objectives, baseline and context
- Links to other strategies, plans and programmes and sustainability objectives
- Description of the social, environmental and economic baseline characteristics and the predicted future baseline
- The Sustainability Appraisal Framework, including objectives, targets and indicators

5 Developing and refining options and assessing effects

- Testing the spatial policy objectives against the sustainability appraisal framework
-Key findings

6 Analysis and options – future requirements.
-Significant social, environmental and economic effects of the preferred policy.

7 Implementation – future requirements
- Methodology – further actions to undertake following key recommendations

Appendix 1 Scope of international and national policies

Appendix 2 Summary of findings to take forward from quick scope

Appendix 3 Policy review findings

Appendix 4 SWOT analysis

Appendix 5 Key issues and problems

Appendix 6 Sustainability Objectives

Appendix 7 Policy compatibility matrix

Appendix 8 Summary of recommendations

Section 1: Introduction to Sustainable Environmental Assessment

1 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISALS

Background

Sustainability is about taking full consideration of the consequences of our actions on the quality of life of present and future generations and this concept is central to Governments planning for the future in new development, and all aspects of the environment. A commonly accepted definition of sustainable development is '*Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'*.

The focus of sustainability is on encouraging joined up activities which meet local regional and national goals, not just on the narrow economic factors, but on those wider social and environmental factors influencing the health of the country. It is about achieving success for society, the economy, and the environment in harmony, rather than each one being achieved at the expense of the other.

There is a need for each region to explore how we can achieve environmental or social benefits through economic gain and how we can, for example, achieve economic goals and social development through environmental enhancement. Creative thinking is required to achieve benefits from activities which would traditionally be seen as opposing. It is these principles which we hope to explore and apply to our emerging spatial policy for gardens. This is to ensure that we can gain the maximum value from our cultural heritage assets in a way which provides sustainable growth for the future.

Sustainability and green spaces

The gardens spatial strategy study has been developed in order to encourage more people to use and understand public greenspaces, in particular parks and gardens as a cultural asset. Extensive baseline work and limited consultation has provided the basis for the identification of the quality and sustainable requirements of existing garden heritage assets in Cheshire as well as any other long term economic requirements. The spatial policy for gardens being developed uses this work as an evidence base upon which to realign resources and policies to reflect new priorities identified.

The spatial policy for gardens will have a number of objectives which will be tested through this process. The overall aims are to:

- Improve the understanding of garden heritage assets
- Improve accessibility for all to parks and gardens

- Change people's perceptions of greenspaces as areas to visit and use more often.
- Improve facilities and attractions
- Increase the number of tourists attending any such site
- Develop opportunities for using garden heritage assets for greater learning
- Exploit the heritage aspects of Cheshire's greenspace
- Promote green spaces as drivers for economic activity.

Purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal

Background to building sustainability into UK plans and strategies

Whilst sustainable development has been increasingly on the agenda for sometime, this concept was embraced and driven forward through the European SEA Directive was introduced in 2004. The SEA Directive applies to a wide range of plans and programmes including those for town and country planning and land use. It will apply to both the present system of development plans and Regional Planning Guidance and the emerging Local Development Documents and Regional Spatial Strategies being developed in the UK.

The objective of the SEA Directive is '*to provide for a high level of protection of the environment … with a view to promoting sustainable development'*. These aims are consistent with a range of Government policies and have been reflected for some years in guidance for planning authorities. The Directive's main areas of emphasis are on:

• collecting and presenting baseline environmental information;

• predicting the significant environmental effects of the plan and addressing them during its preparation;

• identifying strategic alternatives and their effects;

• consulting the public and authorities with environmental responsibilities as part of the assessment process;

• monitoring the actual environmental effects of the plan during its implementation.

What the Sustainable Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal process will achieve:

The SEA/SA process will help to identify issues of local, regional and national importance. It will help policymakers to think creatively as well as identify synergies between different plans and identify negative impacts of the policies being developed. The tools used enable policymakers to monitor the effectiveness of policies in order to make the policies more sustainable.

Sustainability appraisal (SA) and SEA

It is intended that SA conducted in accordance with the guidance set out should meet the requirements of the SEA directive for environmental assessment of plans. SEA is primarily focused on environmental effects. While the directive defines the environment broadly, including population, human health, cultural heritage and material assets as well as biodiversity, air, water and soil, Sustainability Appraisal goes further by examining all the sustainability-related effects of the plans, whether they are social, environmental or economic. A key output of the SEA and SA process is an environmental report which describes the environmental assessment process and likely significant effects of implementation of the plan and reasonable plan options. The report will cover effects other than those directly related to the environment. The SA report must clearly show that the Directive requirements in relation to the Environmental report have been met.

So who should undertake a Sustainability Appraisal?

The production of the SA is usually the responsibility of the relevant planning body, however for a more specific focused SA this should be undertaken by a group of people together who can

- Consider and respond to local circumstances
- Take a balanced and objective view
- Understand the issues
- Draw on good practice elsewhere
- Evaluate the full range of sustainability issues

For the purpose of this document, this is a pilot study which is designed to primarily act as a guide for future topic specific sustainability based studies. This document has therefore been designed to provide a methodology toolkit as a principle objective, whilst taking the reader through a worked example based on our spatial strategy for gardens. It is hoped that the report will be used as the basis for other garden based sustainability reports, and will be used as a basis on which to develop similar toolkits elsewhere in the regions.

Compliance with SEA Directive

This scoping report for the Sustainability Appraisal of the spatial strategy for gardens has been undertaken in accordance with the ODPM draft guidance on sustainability appraisals. This guidance incorporates the requirements of the SEA directive. In order to demonstrate compliance with the SEA directive all the SEA requirements are listed in Appendix A. Those which relate to the production of this scoping report are highlighted in the table.

Appraisal Methodology

There are 5 key stages within the Sustainability Appraisal process. These stages are outlined in table 1 below.

Stages of the Sustainability Appraisal process

Table 1: Stages involved in completing the Sustainability Appraisal process.

Stage A	**Setting the context and objectives, establishing baseline and deciding the scope.**
A1	Identifying other relevant plans, programmes and sustainability objectives.
A2	Collecting baseline information
A3	Identifying sustainability issues
A4	Developing the Sa framework
A5	Testing the plan objectives against the SA framework
A6	Consulting on the scope of the SA
Stage B	**Developing and refining options**
B1	Appraising issues and options
B2	Consulting on the SA of the emerging options
Stage C	**Appraising the effects of the plan**
C1	Predicting the effects of the policy and policy options
C2	Assessing the effects of the policy
C3	Mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects
C4	Developing proposals for monitoring
C5	Preparing the SA report
Stage D	**Consulting on the policy SA report**
D1	Consulting on the SA report alongside the policy
D2	Appraising significant changes
D3	Decision making and providing information
Stage E	**Monitoring and implementation of the Policy**
E1	Monitoring the significant effects of the policy
E2	Responding to adverse effects

Breakdown of the SA process: milestones to achieve:

1. Gather information to support the appraisal and review relevant plans and policies, identifying objectives, targets and indicators to inform the sustainability objectives for the SEA

2. Identify draft sustainability objectives, using a number of sources of information including the North West sustainability objectives in order to identify the scope and nature of sustainability concerning parks and gardens.

These stages form the content of the **scoping report**. This enables policy makers to refine the scope of the checklist questions used in assessing the policies, identify potential gaps, areas where further work is required, identify negative impacts requiring development, and identify key areas for assessment.

The next stage should be using the objectives to consider how the performance of the sub-regional strategies could be improved.

3. Set out appraisal findings and recommendations, and use these to inform subsequent strategy development and decide upon a preferred strategy

4. Review sustainability implications of preferred strategy identifying how it has developed from earlier options

The final stage is the production of a final report, setting out the baseline and methodology, then setting out objectives, options and preferred recommendations.

The scoping report is the product of the tasks undertaken as part of **Stage C** of the process (see EA table). The purpose and detailed methodology for each of these tasks is included within the relevant sections in the main report.

Content of the Scoping Report and consultation

The scoping report summarises the work required for Stage A of the Sustainability Appraisal of the spatial policy for gardens. The scoping report contains the following information:

- The spatial policy for gardens objectives (see section 2)
- Identification of plans, programmes and objectives which effect the policy (see section 2)
- Baseline information which is directly relevant to the spatial policy.
- Social, environmental and economic issued identified as a result of the baseline study and policy review.
- An SA framework against which to appraise the spatial policy (including development of sustainability objectives)

The SEA directive requires that statutory consultees are consulted on the contents of the report – namely English Nature, English Heritage, the Countryside Agency and The Environment Agency. There would also be a number of other consultees who would be consulted. Given that this is a template for other future SA on spatial garden policies, we do not propose to undertake the consultation for the purposes of

this report. However suggestions are given to some of the consultees who could be included is provided as a guide.

- North West Development Agency
- CABE Space
- Groundwork
- Regional Spatial Strategy team

Section 2: Sustainability Appraisal

Spatial Garden Policy - A Toolkit

Sustainability objectives, baseline and context

Methodology

The ODPM guidance advises that the first stage of the process is to set the context and establish the baseline conditions that you are working with. This includes identifying other relevant plans, programmes and objectives, collecting baseline information and then moving on to developing SEA objectives. Undertaking this work will help suggest ideas for how constraints can be addressed, and provide an evidence base for an assessment, enabling us to predict effects and provide subsequent monitoring of SEA objectives.

Link to other strategies, plans, programmes and sustainability objectives

Quick Scoping Exercise

To complete the initial scoping exercise, the guidance advises that it is important to identify the ways in which the policy contributes to the regional sustainability objectives. One way to do this is to undertake a quick scoping exercise, which will enable us to highlight key issues for further investigation, and possible omissions. To undertake the scoping exercise, the initial stage is to briefly identify the ways in which our current policies contribute to the regional sustainability objectives, and the ones specifically highlighted which contribute to regional parks and gardens development.

This stage is mirrored in the more traditional SEA process and is a means of analysing the broad scope of policies, and their impacts. The "*Integrated Appraisal Toolkit - Implementing Action for Sustainability: An Integrated Appraisal Toolkit for the North West*" which was published by the North West Regional Assembly in 2003 provides a methodology for undertaking such a quick scoping exercise.

For the purposes of this report we undertook a full review of the current national and international policies which were available and which had the potential to impact on parks and gardens. The toolkit was used as a means of analysing the broad scope of these policies. Given the nature of the policy documents that were chosen and the limitations on timescale, it was decided that reviewing all of the policies in each policy document was not feasible and would not necessarily be the most productive method of ascertaining the policies which would impact parks and gardens. We therefore decided upon a shortlist of those policies which had the most important links to gardens and which would be fundamental to the baseline review at this stage. Whilst we want to tailor the review to reflect our circumstances, we also wanted to ensure that we maintain the balance between economic, social and environmental considerations.

The principle policies for the selected documents are:

Draft Regional Spatial Strategy 2006

Relevant Policy	Relevant Sub-division of policy
W1	Strengthening the Regional Economy
RDF3	Rural Areas
RT7	Regional Framework for Walking and Cycling
W6	Tourism and the Visitor Economy
EM1	Integrated Land Management
EM3	Green Infrastructure

Regional Economic Strategy principle policies

Key activity reference	Relevant Sub-division of policy
4.5	Improve quality of heritage buildings and improve public spaces
5.3	Implement the Rural Development Programme
10.1	Implement regional marketing programme and promote strong regional image
10.2	Implement cultural strategy
10.3	Implement Tourism Strategy
NR1	Natural resources

Planning Policy Guidance Note 15

Key activity reference	Relevant Sub-division of policy
Para 2.24	Historic parks and gardens
Para 2.26	The wider historic landscape
Para 6.40	Historic landscapes

Spatial Vision for North West Europe

Relevant Policy	Relevant Sub-division of policy
Ensuring more fairness in the distribution of prosperity in NW Europe	Assisting the development of transnational strategies aimed at exploiting economic potential
Reducing NW Europe's global environmental impact	Promoting the sustainable use of resources
Protecting and creatively managing the natural and cultural heritage	Identifying and protecting sites of transnational significance
	Establishing and extending the network of natural and open spaces
	Securing and improving the quality of other natural resources including air, soil, biodiversity and tranquillity
	Ensuring the creative management of cultural assets
Maintaining high levels of access to and from NW Europe	Avoiding concentration in a few centres and inappropriate investment in underused infrastructure
Improving internal access and mobility in a sustainable way	Promoting the development of transnational public transport strategies
	Ensuring that gateway functions are properly co-ordinated with internal communication networks and new spatial development patterns
	Promoting inter-modality and inter-operability and the avoidance of unnecessary air travel

Copies of the summary of the policies scoped are found in appendix 1, and a copy of the main findings from this scope to take forward is found in appendix 2.

The process that was undertaken was an important step in analysing the broad scope of the policies and the relevance to parks and gardens. The toolkit that was used as a methodology provided a very thorough means of assessing the policies. However the method advised proved to be a very long and time consuming process. The process undertaken produced documentation in the form of tables which were quite lengthy. As a result, the main findings from the scope have been included for detail in this report as an appendix. The full quick scoping exercise can be found in the separate document entitled 'Sustainability Appraisal of spatial garden policies: Quick Scoping document'.

Identifying and analysing other relevant policies, plans and programmes

A review of plans, policies and programmes has been carried out in order to identify external objectives and issues which should be considered when developing the spatial policy for gardens. The policies cover a range of geographical levels and topics. Identifying relationships with relevant policies, plans and programmes will enable us to identify any external social, environmental or economic objectives that should be taken into account in the Sustainability Appraisal of the project.

In order to develop the sustainability objectives on which we will base the sustainability appraisal, we decided to use a combination of previous work undertaken to date on the EGHN project including the (1) policy review, (2) regional sustainability development indicators identified in the Regional Development Agency, (3) the Regional Spatial Strategy work, and (4) review of the quick scoping exercise as detailed above.

1 The EGHN Policy Review and Cultural Case Study.

The works previously undertaken by the Spatial Strategy team provided essential background information and form the basis of this initial work. The policy review which was undertaken in March 2004 (appendix 4), and the case study of Cultural and Tourism policy tools were finalised in September 2004. This policy review and case study work assessed the following policies within the UK

- Regional Cultural Strategy
- Regional Tourism Strategy
- Sub Regional Cultural Strategy
- Cheshire County Council Cultural Strategy
- Regional Economic Strategy
- Regional Planning Guidance
- Cheshire County Council Structure Plan
- Cheshire County Council Tourism Strategy
- District Local Plan

The information provided by this has been used to inform the development of the sustainability objectives.

2 Regional sustainability development indicators

We also decided that it would be useful to establish which standard regional objectives would be relevant to Parks and Gardens. There are currently 30 North West Regional Sustainability Objectives which form the basis of regional policies. Only 8 of these objectives are directly linked to the development of parks and gardens, and are useful in the work of the EGHN. Due to this, it is necessary to remove those objectives which are not relevant, and develop some objectives which have a direct impact on garden heritage and culture.

The 8 listed for the North West from the Regional Sustainability Objectives are:

1) Mainstream sustainable development and integrate activities across the region
2) Deliver Rural Renaissance
3) Deliver Urban Renaissance
4) Develop and market the Region's image
5) Protect, enhance and manage the Region's rich diversity of cultural and built environmental assets
6) Protect and enhance the biodiversity, local character and accessibility of the landscape across the region
7) Improve the health and reduce health inequalities
8) Improve the competitiveness and productivity of business

3 Regional Spatial Strategy work

We have decided to use the existing information provided by the scoping analysis from those of the four policies which have been recently reviewed within the Policy Review (for summary see Appendix 3). The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) have both identified sustainability objectives. The Regional Economic Strategy draft challenges were compared to the sustainability objectives for the Northwest. Unfortunately the majority of the objectives and challenges identified in the RES do not relate to parks and gardens, and are therefore not relevant to be included in this study. Therefore it will be necessary to include some challenges which are not directly related to the RES in our SEA.

Following consideration of the North West Sustainability objectives, and those highlighted by the SEA assessment of the RES and RSS we selected the following sustainability objectives for the purposes of the Spatial policy for Gardens:

A. To develop and market the regions image
B. Deliver rural renaissance
C. Improve the physical health and mental health and reduce health inequalities
D. To protect enhance and manage the Region's rich diversity of cultural and built environmental assets
E. Protect and improve local environmental quality

F. Protect and enhance the biodiversity, local character and accessibility of the landscape across the region.
G. Improving the quality and competitiveness in the visitor economy
H. Ensure economic growth is underpinned by sustainable communities

In addition to these standard sustainability objectives already identified by the RSS and RES scoping analysis, to make a comprehensive review for gardens, it is necessary to include a number of other objectives relevant to a new spatial policy for gardens. These are objectives which have been drawn up following intense consideration of the different policies and plans in place today. The objectives chosen are:

1. Develop the value, importance and contribution of heritage assets
2. Enhance the socio economic importance of parks, gardens and open spaces
3. Raise the profile of culture and importance in regional development
4. Enhance regions natural landscape
5. Encourage greater access and engagement in gardens, parks and open spaces

Description of the social, environmental and economic baseline characteristics

Baseline information provides the basis for predicting and monitoring effects and helps to identify sustainability problems and alternatives to dealing with them. Baseline information may consist of mainly indicators with quantitative and qualitative. It is useful to form a list of questions when considering the baseline information required:

- How good or bad is the current situation? Do trends show that it is getting better or worse?
- How far is the current situation from any established thresholds or targets?
- Are problems reversible or irreversible?
- How difficult would it be to offset or remedy the damage?
- Have there been any significant cumulative or synergistic effects over time?

Due to the time constraints of this project and the need to develop a thorough methodology and toolkit for undertaking this process it is not possible to provide a full consideration of the baseline characteristics of the current gardens policies. Therefore our initial draft baseline information draws on the policy review undertaken during the Spatial Strategy work and the case study work. The findings can be found in Appendix 3.

The Sustainability Appraisal Framework

Identifying sustainability issues and problems

The identification of the sustainability issues is an opportunity to define key issues for the project and to develop sustainable plan objectives and options. This is made up of the SWOT analysis (Appendix 4) undertaken by the project team and will also draw upon the issues highlighted by the work undertaken in appendix 1, 2 and 3. The full table is found in Appendix 5.

Developing the sustainability appraisal framework

This provides a means by which sustainability effects can be described, analysed and compared. The framework consists of sustainability objectives or indicators which can be revised as sustainability issues and problems are identified. Sustainability objectives provide a means of checking whether the objectives of the new spatial policy for gardens are the best possible ones for sustainability, and can be seen a methodological yardstick against which the social environmental and economic effects of the policy can be tested.

The SA objectives need to address the full cross section of sustainability issues including social, environmental and economic factors; and others devised specifically in relation to the context of the project, using the work identified in the previous work as specified. Baseline information and sustainability issues will also be useful in identifying objectives and indicators.

To undertake the appraisal of the project the first stage is to draw on the work of the baseline review and develop our objectives which will form the basis of our new gardens policy.

The purpose of an overarching sustainability appraisal framework has been identified as a means of describing, analysing and comparing sustainability effects of the policy. The framework consists of

- sustainability appraisal objectives with which to test the objectives of the spatial policy for gardens
- sustainability indicators with which to measure the effects of the policy in the future

Appendix 6 sets out the spatial gardens policy objectives and the chosen SA objectives which are relevant to the project. There are currently 30 North West Regional Sustainability Objectives which form the basis of regional policies. The SA objectives chosen reflect those highlighted in the '*Action for Sustainability Integrated Toolkit*' and those objectives used in relevant policies for gardens identified as part of the policy review, and they have been chosen due to their relevance and importance to the gardens project aims. This issue is discussed further in previous sections.

The SEA directive has a requirement to undertake consultation on the scope of the sustainability appraisal following the establishment of the sustainability appraisal framework. This involves seeking the view of the four statutory environmental consultation bodies designated in the SEA regulations on the scope and level of

detail of the environmental information to be included in the SA report. The guidance also recommends preparation of a Scoping report setting out the information collected at Stage A of the SA process. This normally includes a general section which sets out the elements common to all gardens policies and a second part reporting on each garden policy individually (e.g. the objectives of the individual policy, sustainability issues and problems specific to it and any broad options to be considered). This stage usually requires up to 5 weeks for consultation and modification. Due to the timescales required for this stage, and in view of this document being used as a pilot study with establishment of a draft methodology it is not appropriate at this stage for this piece of work to undertake this step. When undertaking the full appraisal this should however be done.

Developing and refining options and assessing effects.

Testing the spatial policy objectives against the sustainability appraisal framework

This stage is designed to appraise in broad terms the effects of options for garden policy objectives. The objectives of the spatial policy for gardens set out what it is aiming to achieve in spatial planning terms and set the context for development of options for the policy. It is important for the objectives of the gardens policy are in accordance with sustainability principles if the policy is to achieve real social, environmental and economic benefits from gardens. The objectives should be tested for compatibility with the SA objectives, and this will help in refining the garden policy objectives as well as identifying options. The gardens policy objectives also need to be consistent with each other, and using the Sustainability Appraisal objectives will be one way of checking this.

In undertaking the full appraisal we need to consider both the main envisaged outcomes and impacts of the initiative, as well as those which may be indirect or spin off effects. Consideration should therefore be given to the likely strategic impacts of the policy as well as those anticipated at the local level. We will use a simple rating system. Although it will be fairly subjective, it can be used to identify the degree of impact that is likely to result.

The compatibility matrix

For this study we will use a compatibility matrix to test the internal compatibility of the SA objectives. This matrix is taken from the ODPM guidance on Sustainability Appraisals. This will help identify tensions between objectives that cannot be resolved, and the compatibility matrix will clarify these so that subsequent decisions are well based and mitigation or alternatives can be considered.

Appendix 7 has the full compatibility matrix for the spatial gardens policy.

For the purposes of the compatibility matrix the scoring system to be used is as follows:

++	very positive impact (this symbol is generally used for policies or objectives that are directed specifically at the issue raised by the Sustainability objective in question.)
+	positive impact
-	negative impact
D	impact depends on implementation (policy/objective would enable a positive impact but whether such an impact is achieved will depend on how it is implemented. A D is regarded as a satisfactory score.)
?	impact unknown or uncertain
	(blank) impact uncertain

In some cases there is no obvious link or conflict between the objectives, these are indicated by a blank space. In some cases links are possible and depends upon the implementation, and in this case these are indicated by a D. In other cases links may be possible but tenuous and this is indicated with a question mark. Where there are very strong positive impacts a double cross is indicated and in all other cases where there is a positive link a single cross is used. Where there is a potentially negative impact a dash is used.

ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

Significant social, environmental and economic effects of the preferred policy

A summary of the sustainability of each spatial policy for gardens objective is given below which is based on the compatibility matrix. Overall it becomes clear from the matrix that the objectives are largely in line with sustainability depending on how the objectives are translated into actions. One area of concern that has been highlighted in the matrix is the potential for new economic developments being promoted at the cost of cultural parks, gardens and greenspaces. The nature and magnitude of these potential negative impacts will depend on how the objectives are out into practice. However each objective addresses detailed issues of sustainability and highlights the measures which need to be taken forward in the formation of new garden policies.

Objective 1: Develop the value, importance and contribution of heritage assets

This objective shows a strong positive compatibility with sustainability objectives managing to ensure that cultural assets are positively valued. There are a number of sustainability objectives which directly compliment the gardens objective and this means that current policy documents are inclusive of cultural assets. There are no identified negative impacts from this objective. The areas which are identified as uncertain which could therefore potentially present negative impacts, have a strong economic theme relating to ensuring economic use of land, economic inclusion and healthy labour market.

Recommendation: Careful planning and management is required here to ensure that future economic development principles compliment careful management of heritage assets.

Objective 2: Enhance the socio economic importance of parks, gardens and open spaces

This objective is largely positive but has room for unpredictable impacts depending upon how the objective was implemented. The objective is an important one, given that it aims to bridge the gap between the positive promotion of cultural assets and the strive for economic prosperity and a thriving economy. The objective is positive in that there are no recognised negative impacts, but leaves room for possible uncertainty.

Recommendation: careful thought into how the objective is managed and promoted is required, need for this objective to be incorporated into the economic strategies and designed to reflect recognition of value of gardens in economic prosperity.

Objective 3: Raise the profile of cultural importance in regional development.

This objective is generally compatible with sustainability objectives encouraging culture to be a central feature of regional development and future priorities for investment. The high frequency of blank or uncertain and ‘D’s concludes that the objective of raising the profile of culture in the region is heavily dependant on the way this is marketed and implemented. The degree of uncertainty provides room for negativity if the policy is not implemented successfully.

Recommendation: inclusion of cultural promotion in economic strategies and ensure that policies are strongly cultural orientated in new development and new strategies.

Objective 4: Enhance the regions natural landscape.

This objective has both strong positive and negative impacts. The objective is important in protected the natural landscape of the region and this is an important objective for parks and gardens. This also offers great potential if the landscape is

enhanced with links to economic development and regeneration. The gaps exist where it is not clear where the objective can successfully knit with other regional policies for example how much the enhancement of the regional natural landscape will secure economic inclusion and develop a healthy labour market.

Recommendation: add to wording of the objective to ensure proactive enhancement of natural landscape in line with economic strategy.

Objective 5: Encourage greater access and engagement in gardens and open space.

General compatibility between objectives. The objective contributes to a lot of the sustainability objectives which is a positive impact. There are gaps where the objective would not necessarily provide direct economic benefits or inclusion. It would be difficult to alter the policy to reflect this as this would require evidence of the impact, which is not available. However no direct conflict and general compatibility.

Recommendation: Possibly need to strengthen the policy to show the positive economic impact on a region, for tourism and inward investment resulting from greater access to open space.

Objective 6: Expand use of gardens beyond nature conservation interests

Mixed impacts. This objective has the potential to have some very positive impacts widening the value that gardens have to offer. The reason there is uncertainty about the impact of the objective is that it would need to be installed into policies which are generally lacking garden focus.

Recommendation: Expand the objective to include the use of more economic focused terms, specifically mention what uses should be encouraged including tourism, investment regeneration and cultural. Make objective use criteria recognised by RES and other strategic documents.

Objective 7: Encourage cross sector marketing of garden heritage assets between different sectors

Not clear how this would contribute to such things as delivering urban renaissance. Securing economic inclusion and exploiting business development. The objective would loosely achieve these but not to any great degree. The objective could be more explicit and state the reason why there should be cross sector marketing across different sectors, specifying what the main outcome of this is.

Recommendation: Tailor the objective to outline exactly what these measures should achieve in specific detail.

Objective 8: Improve public access to garden heritage assets.

This objective has the main aim of achieving greater access to the gardens. This is achieved in part by the objective but also has room for some tightening of the wording to ensure that this conforms with the sustainable development policies. This is particularly the case for mainstreaming sustainable development and protecting the regions rich diversity of cultural and environmental assets. Better access to such sites often comes at a cost to the environment, and the objective does not seem to fully incorporate this. It also lacks acknowledgement on the fact that improved public access to garden heritage sites can act as an economic incentive for businesses and develop a healthy labour market. This links in with general objectives of the development agencies and the economic strategies and is a gap which needs to be filled. There is also little targeted focus for minority and difficult to reach groups of the community as well as the aim of attracting new users to the gardens. It does not give much direction on how the access can be improved.

Recommendation: Amend the wording to provide for greater scope for sustainable access which is environmentally sensitive, provide an emphasis on encouraging access to sites which can provide important local economic gain and support local businesses. Ensure there is scope for this in the objective and the objective needs to stress the importance of including access for important groups that have previously been discounted and neglected, as well as encouraging general greater access to gardens.

Objective 9: Ensure new development positively promotes greenspaces to address gap between built development and greenspace enhancement.

Mixed performance on this objective. The fundamental aims of this objective are crucial and supported in general in what this is trying to achieve. However without more detail and focus, this may not achieve all that it could. With careful development this could provide a means of managing the regions rich diversity of cultural assets and deliver urban and rural renaissance. This is particular the case in new development and it could particularly help to mainstream sustainable development. There is important links to improving the competitiveness of new businesses and the region as a whole. That said, this objective would have to be strongly focused and firm in its stance, as this would be one area which would be under ever increasing pressure. As more and more new development takes place, the pressure for land availability increases and allocation of land for greenspace, and the positive promotion of greenspace, will have to stand up to the obvious economic incentive of development. The policy must be worded to be strong and clear in the breadth of the objective and how this will be achieved.

Recommendation: Amend the wording of the text to provide for a firm stance on not only protecting existing greenspace, gardens and parks, but to ensure that new development encourages the maintenance and development of more greenspace assets. This should particularly be the case for new regeneration of area lacking greenspace and development around existing heritage assets. Ensure a firm approach in wording to provide a focus of protect and provide, rather than just the general strategy which is adopted at present. Ensure the

policy reflects the general requirements of the economic strategies fuelling new development and regeneration.

Objective 10: Formation of new conservation priorities in plans for previously developed sites

Difficult to predict how this objective will work in practice. The fundamental principle of this is quite important and could have an important impact in the future if it was easily accommodated and taken up in new policy formation. There would be a need to guide where these priorities would fit into plans for such sites, the most obvious being in local development frameworks.

Recommendation: Firm up wording to ensure that it is clear where the priorities should be included.

Objective 11: Encourage adoption of garden economic appraisals to support enhancement of greenspace in new development

Difficult to predict the outcome as this will not apply to all situations. Garden economic appraisals would be a useful tool to help defend existing gardens and greenspaces and new policy thinking may help to support the use of such tools in the future. It would help contribute to general SD objectives including protecting and enhancing the biodiversity of the landscape in the region. This could also be used as a useful tool for delivering urban and rural renaissance. This objective complies with the majority of SD objectives and supports economic aims of the development agency. This supports the provision of objective 9 in that it would provide evidence to support greenspaces and help to ensure that new development is positively promoted. How relevant this objective is in all new development is however questionable. There is doubt over whether this can be applied in all circumstances and whether it is realistic to encourage this as a standard requirement.

Recommendation: Consider broadening the wording of this objective to provide for economic appraisals where they would provide an opportunity to protect or enhance the garden heritage asset.

Objective 12: Development of quantitative indicators and targets for garden asset assessment with straightforward monitoring criteria.

This objective causes issues due to the uncertainty created by the fact that it is not clear what these indicators and targets would be and what the aim of these are and what they strive to achieve. The targets need to reflect the priorities of the other objectives quite stringently, but more importantly need to be very easily monitored if they are to perform any sort of useful function in assessing the value and quality of gardens. There needs to be more careful thought on this objective to provide more guidance and remove the possibility of problems with interpretation and conflict with other objectives. We would need to decide what we are trying to monitor and for what purpose before setting out to create such quantitative indicators. That said the

principle of having a quantitative indicators and monitoring garden assets is an important consideration especially given the drive to create economy driven assets.

Recommendation: More consideration is given to the detail of this objective. Put in tighter restrictions on what the remit of these quantitative indicators would be and define a purpose for the indicators and targets.

Objective 13: Formation of cross sector vision for the future of garden assets

This objective again has the problem of whether it will be useful and depends upon the implementation and how this will be integrated into any policies. The concept of a cross sector vision would provide a means of ensuring that all aspect of the wider sustainable development of the site: tourism, heritage protection, regeneration and access for all is taken on board and provided for in new policy documents. This is already taking place in many forms at a sub regional and regional level. Support for this needs to be put in place in policy documents if the correct funding and political support is going to be delivered to gardens to take them forward. Including this as an objective would help to keep the gardens on the agenda. It would broadly reflect the sustainable development principles and would certainly support the current strategic thinking in central and local government. There is some doubt over how strong this policy objective should be worded.

Recommendation: This objective is consistent with other sustainable development criteria, and reflects the general approach being taken at a sub regional level by bodies associated with gardens. Amend the text to include formation of and 'consistent support for' to ensure that this is a continued exercise taken on board for the medium to long term to provide a means of influencing policy development and informing new guidance in relation to emerging policies of a strategic nature.

Objective 14: Formation of new strategic spatial garden body

This objective has similar issues to the previous objective as it would provide an essential means of accessing and linking into strategic drivers of policy delivery and policy formation. The issue again lies with how useful this would be and whether the key areas of policy development are regularly influenced by a garden policy group. There are issues over how feasible this would be and what level of input would be required. This would have implications on resources available. The concept is positive and would the objective would contribute to the general sustainable development criteria. The question really is at what level this could be achieved and how far do we see this body accessing strategic panels. The objective should be retained but it is impossible to assess how far this can be achieved and what the likely implications of this objective are on the sustainable development criteria in full without knowing the details of this body and the influence this may have. Certainly including this objective would help to contribute to protecting and enhancing the regions cultural assets and develop and market the regions image. Whilst there are gaps in the matrix which indicate that there are areas of uncertainty which could result in conflict, there is nothing to suggest from the wording of this objective that the

impacts would be negative or conflict with the general sustainable development objectives at this time.

Recommendation: The objective should be retained but should also be expanded to provide clarification on where this garden body would fit into the policy formation hierarchy and what function this garden body would take.

Objective 15: Formation of observatory on garden heritage assets

There appears to be duplication with this objective and objective 14. The function of the strategic garden body would be amongst other functions, the observatory role considering new garden policies and what influence the spatial garden policy body can have on this, ensuring that the spatial policy for garden objectives is incorporated in this. There are also a significantly larger amount of gaps and uncertainties in the policy assessment matrix than in objective 14.

Recommendation: That this objective be removed as this function will be performed by another.

Objective 16: Ensure gardens included as a priority in policy formation and policy review.

This supports the sustainable development criteria for protecting and enhancing the regions cultural assets and enhancing biodiversity, local character and accessibility to landscape. The inclusion of gardens as a priority in policy formation is a very crucial step to generating interest and support, both financial and political, for garden heritage assets. This is an important objective but it is equally important to ensure that the objective does not conflict with other priorities and Sustainable Development objectives which might have a more prominent role in policies. If the spatial policy for gardens can be proven to support the principle policies of the development plans and the regional development agencies then it will be more able to integrate in the new policy documents.

Recommendation: This objective should be retained and strengthened in the wording of the text.

Objective 17: Ensure better educational tools for gardens

This objective is quite specific and contributes to the sustainable development criteria for improving educational achievement, training and lifelong learning. This objective does not conflict with any of the other SD objectives and does make a positive contribution to the spatial policy for gardens objectives so in that respect is worthwhile.

Recommendation: objective to be retained in its current form.

Objective 18: Ensure rural sites are given equal weight and priority to redress the balance between rural, suburb and city regions.

This is an important objective as a lot of the garden heritage sites are in rural locations and often suffer as a consequence. Development policies in particular are often focused on the urban city regions and there is a general focus on redevelopment in built up areas. There is often significant pressure on the areas of open space and those sites which could have huge potential economic value for other uses, including garden heritage sites. It is important that rural sites are equally represented and enhanced. The objective contributes to many of the sustainable development criteria and it is essential that this issue is addressed in new policies. However the objective lacks clarity on the scope, principally what role we would have this play in addressing the in balance between development and protection of gardens. There is obvious conflict on this issue which the policy could address this gap and highlight the need for the enhancement of gardens.

Recommendation: That the policy be strengthened in the text to ensure that 'rural garden sites' are highlighted in particular, not just rural sites as a whole.

Objective 19: Ensure greater guidance on future economic priorities to provide opportunities for garden investment.

This is another objective which will feed into the strategic garden body to be set up. The policy assessment matrix highlights that this objective compliments many of the sustainable development criteria set out and contributes to achieving, in particular, the delivery of the urban and rural renaissance, securing economic inclusion and mainstreaming sustainable development activities across the region. The objective is key to ensuring that the development of new policies for regional development reflect a broader scope incorporating not just typical inward investment development. The objective does not really conflict with any SD objectives and there would be no value in incorporating any of the other SD objectives where the policy assessment matrix has highlighted there is an uncertain impact, as this objective is quite specific to the achievement of improved economic value of gardens, and specific to the strategic garden body.

Recommendation: Objective should be retained in its current form.

Objective 20: Formation of regional target for garden heritage development.

This objective generally scores positively on the policy assessment matrix, with no negative scores and few uncertain impacts. The formation of targets for garden heritage development is important in achieving new support for this issue in development plans. The concept of the objective is supported but would require alterations to ensure that the It is too difficult to predict the impact of the objective as in its present form it is to vague. There is no way of determining the impact as there is no definition of what the regional targets are aiming to achieve and what the expected impact would be. There needs to be more specific guidance on the scope of the regional targets to enable this to be a detailed and useful objective.

Recommendation: That the wording of the objective be tightened to ensure that there is greater guidance on what regional targets would be developed and provide clarity on the outcomes to be achieved. Suggested that the targets reflect the indicators set out in the regional economic strategy or similar, to provide continuity and clear relationships between the objective and the regional strategies.

Objective 21: Set targets for enticing greater users groups to the gardens.

This objective has a large number blank spaces on the policy assessment matrix which would indicate that the impact of the objective is uncertain. The objective aims to entice greater user groups into the gardens but does not state how the objective would be used and to which targets the objective would relate. Would it for example be used as a target in a development plan, access strategy or used in more garden orientated policy documents? There are also degrees of similarity between this objective and the previous one. Whilst the concept is one which would be supported, and there is a gap in policy documents for this type of target based approach for gardens, it is unclear how the objective could be used to its full potential without some modification.

Recommendation: That the wording of the objective be amended to reflect the need for greater clarification on where these targets would be used. Amend wording to include 'set targets, linked to the RES and development plans' for enticing greater users groups to the gardens, and use as a basis for quantifiable monitoring'.

Objective 22: Ensure qualitative targets for gardens are supported by future policy formation.

This objective has a number of blank spaces on the policy assessment matrix. This reflects the fact that the qualitative targets are not readily defined and makes it difficult to predict any likely outcome. The principle of this objective remains important to the development of garden heritage assets which are valued, and positive clear monitoring is essential for measure if the garden heritage assets are going to be proven to be achieving a positive output. The development of measurable quantitative targets would support the provisions of the regional development agency approach in providing policy and financial support for new areas of development. The question is how to ensure the qualitative targets are included in new policy formation and whether the principle of this would be acceptable to the policy makers.

Recommendation: That the objective is expanded to include 'through on going lobbying of policy makers, government bodies and other relevant organisations'.

The full set of key findings is found in appendix 9.

The spatial policy for gardens objectives are largely sustainable but some uncertainty exists over the extent and nature of the impacts. The impact of these objectives, whether positive or negative will depend on the implementation of these objectives and the formation of an action plan.

IMPLEMENTATION – FUTURE REQUIREMENTS

Methodology : Further actions to undertake following key recommendations.

Testing the spatial garden policy options.

The key recommendations which have been developed are essential to the formation of any new spatial policy for gardens. The recommendations are important in both the evaluation of the performance of current policy documents, and the formation of new policy tools. It is hoped that the toolkit would provide a good sound methodology for any organisation considering the implications of development policies and how the garden assets can play a key role in this.

Whilst the purpose of this report is to establish a set of key recommendations for use in future garden policy formation, for the purposes of the toolkit it is important to outline the other key steps for those wishing to undergo a full appraisal.

It is useful to establish a number of options by which to progress the policies. In order to ensure that the policy recommendation will improve the situation which would exist if there were no spatial garden policy for gardens, a comparison of the recommendations in place, and the 'no action' option has been carried out. Each option is tested against the objectives of the sustainability appraisal framework a done previously in the process. Each option is appraised against the framework using a series of symbols to indicate the levels of impact.

From using the table and establishing the 'no action' and 'implementation of recommendations' likely results, the positive and negative impacts are likely to become clear. It should be the case from this table that there are a significant number of benefits in implementing the recommendations.

The SEA Directive also requires that consideration is given to the secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects of the policy objectives. The definition of these terms is found in the ODPM SEA Guidance 2005 and this guidance provides the methodology to consider the secondary cumulative and synergistic effects should this be required. It may become clear from consideration of these effects that there are tensions between the different elements of sustainability needs in garden policies. Careful consideration of the differing impacts of each option is required, and it is important to determine which sustainability issues are most important and how a balance can be found to maximise social, environmental and economic gain whilst minimising adverse impacts.

Concluding remarks:

Within the appraisal of a spatial policy for gardens a sustainability appraisal would appraise the policies within it and determine how the document would translate into decision making. This was based on a future policy, hence there are no policies so it will be the place of an Action Plan to determine how the broad spatial garden policies will be implemented. It is also important to identify if the very specific issues relating to garden policies which were identified in the scoping report have been addressed. The draft spatial policy for gardens objectives has recognised many of the sustainability issues raised in the scoping work and it is this which provides the building blocks to develop action plans to respond to them. With this type of work there is going to be a number of areas where the strategy has not addressed certain sustainability issues or where actions cannot fully address the impact. It is not the purpose of this report or this toolkit to try and attempt to identify and address each and every issue and within in the process the team must ascertain which issues are the most fundamental to this process, and must then only attempt to address these.

This is a long process and often requires the input of many people from different specialisms. The topics that are discussed require this specialist input and this can take a lot of time and manpower. It is important to establish a team which has the necessary understanding of the issues and which can each work in a collective framework to provide the collaboration required to fully address these issues. There is also a lot of guidance in this field and it is very easy to become weighed down by a variety of different methodologies and toolkits to follow. It is therefore important from the outset to identify the issues that you want to test, the objectives that you are striving to achieve and set a clear aim and timescale in place to achieve this.

APPENDIX 1: SCOPE OF INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL POLICIES

National and International Policies

Draft Regional Spatial Strategy 2006

Relevant Policy	Relevant Sub-division of policy	Content relevant to spatial policy for parks and gardens
W1	Strengthening the Regional Economy	Promotion of economic development, building on the region's strengths, positively supporting diversification of rural economy and tourism.
RDF3	Rural Areas	Reflects that of policy CS1 in maintaining support for rural areas particularly agriculture and tourism, and ensuring development reflect the countryside including landscape and conservation.
RT7	Regional Framework for Walking and Cycling	Aims to create integrated networks for walking and cycling to capitalise on the environmental and health benefits. Linking leisure opportunities and maximising environmental, social and health benefits.
W6	Tourism and the Visitor Economy	Tourism development is focused on key areas, and there is a focus on improving the regions tourism offer and encouraging rural diversification.
EM1	Integrated Land Management	In Landscape and heritage aims to protect and enhance features that contribute to the character and culture of the landscape
EM3	Green Infrastructure	Promotion of multi-functional networks of green space.

Regional Economic Strategy principle policies

Key activity reference	Relevant Sub-division of policy	Content relevant to spatial policy for parks and gardens
4.5	Improve quality of heritage buildings and improve public spaces	Deliver the aspirations of Urban White paper and Excellence in Physical Regeneration Agenda.
5.3	Implement the Rural Development Programme	Maximise benefits of Regional Rural Renaissance Objectives
10.1	Implement regional marketing programme and promote strong regional image	Promote regional brand and identify opportunities for culture, environment and tourism.
10.2	Implement cultural strategy	Deliver the Cultural Strategy including utilising the cultural gems to enhance the development of the region and encourage citizens to engage in culture.
10.3	Implement Tourism Strategy	Deliver Tourism Strategy and promote the tourism product of the region.
NR1	Natural resources	Assess how to maintain regions natural resources and maximise their contribution to regions image, quality of life, and regional economy.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 15

Key activity reference	Relevant Sub-division of policy	Content relevant to spatial policy for parks and gardens
Para 2.24	Historic parks and gardens	Protection given to historic parks and gardens.
Para 2.26	The wider historic landscape	Protection of important components of the wider historic landscape through development control policies.
Para 6.40	Historic landscapes	Historic landscape and their defining aspects are supported for enhancement.

Spatial Vision for North West Europe

Relevant Policy	Relevant Sub-division of policy	Content relevant to spatial policy for parks and gardens
Ensuring more fairness in the distribution of prosperity in NW Europe	Assisting the development of transnational strategies aimed at exploiting economic potential	Intended to help boost the region's tourism base through extensive marketing and encouragement of 'slow traffic'.
Reducing NW Europe's global environmental impact	Promoting the sustainable use of resources	Through use of sustainable transport to and from gardens and ensuring that the projects remain in line with UK and EU sustainability criteria.
Protecting and creatively managing the natural and cultural heritage	Identifying and protecting sites of transnational significance	With protection given to historic parks and gardens.
	Establishing and extending the network of natural and open spaces	Aim to encourage use of gardens as a recreational space amongst all ages and social groups.
	Securing and improving the quality of other natural resources including air, soil, biodiversity and tranquillity	Assess how to maintain Region's natural resources and maximise their contribution to regions image, quality of life, and regional economy.
	Ensuring the creative management of cultural assets	Use of cultural gems to aid regional tourism development and engage citizens.
Maintaining high levels of access to and from NW Europe	Avoiding concentration in a few centres and inappropriate investment in underused infrastructure	Aim to provide sustainable transport to and from sites using multi-modal networks.
Improving internal access and mobility in a sustainable way	Promoting the development of transnational public transport strategies	Provide affordable, reliable and sustainable transport links.
	Ensuring that gateway functions are properly co-ordinated with	Focus on Regional Spatial Strategy and sustainable spatial development e.g.

	internal communication networks and new spatial development patterns	rural recovery.
	Promoting inter-modality and inter-operability and the avoidance of unnecessary air travel	Provide multi-modal transport networks linking in with the Region's transport infrastructure

APPENDIX 2: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS TO TAKE FORWARD FROM QUICK SCOPE.

Objective	Theme	Scoping number	Scoping results	Impact	Gap	Positives	Negatives	Take forward
RES 4.5								
F	**Protect/enhance biodiversity**		Relevant question					
		22	Y	Uncertain	Y	Potential protection of land quality	N	Y
RES 5.3								
G	**Improve competitiveness of business**	1	Y	Positive	N	Possible increase in tourism	N	Y
		2	Y	Positive	N	Possible increase in rural tourism	N	Y
H	**Ensure economic growth underpinned by sustainable communities**	5	Y	Positive	N	Securing rural renaissance secures robust rural economy	N	Y
B	**Deliver Rural renaissance**	4	Y	Positive	N	Provision of public space	N	Y
RES 10.2								
D	**Protect landscapes of cultural interest**	17	Y	Positive	N	Cultural assets will be priorities for preservation	N	Y
RES 10.1								
D	**Protect landscapes of cultural interest**	17	Y	Positive and negative	N	Attract visitors to these sites	Potentially attracting too many visitors may affect their protection	Y
RES 10.3								
A	**To develop and market regions image**	9	Indirectly	Positive	N	Through marketing regions rural assets may boost image of region	N	Y
B	**Deliver rural renaissance**	4	Y	Positive	N	Indirectly through provision of public space and improvement of existing assets.	N	Y

H	**Ensure economic growth**	5	Y	Positive	N	Securing rural renaissance	N	Y
D	**Protect cultural landscapes**	17	Uncertain	Uncertain	N	Good practice to ensure preservation of cultural assets	N	Y
W1								
A	**Develop and market regions image**	9	Y	Positive	N	Enhancement of region	Quantitative output	Y
D	**Protect landscapes of cultural interest**	17	Y	Negative	Y	None	Conflict with economic development	Y
F	**Protect biodiversity**	22	Y	Uncertain	Y	none	Harm to environment	Y
G	**Improve competitiveness of business**	1	Y	Positive	N	Focus on strengths including rural diversification and tourism	Limited mention of cultural industries	Y
		2	Y	Positive	N	Promotes clusters	N	Y
H	**Ensure economic growth**	16	Y	None	N	None	Uncertain how policy will deliver	Y
RDF3								
A	**Develop and market regions image**	9	Y	Positive	N	Enhancement of region	Quantitative output	Y
D	**Protect landscapes of cultural interest**	17	Y	Possibly negative	N	None	Conflict with existing green space	Y
G	**Improve competitiveness of business**	1	Y	Positive	N	Focus on strengths	Limited mention of cultural industries	Y

APPENDIX 3: POLICY REVIEW FINDINGS

Appendix 3 : Summary of Policy Review

Policies plans and programmes of possible relevance to EGHN project	Possible key issues or problems
National, Regional and Local Context	
Regional Planning Guidance	No specific actions identified, provides overall broad strategic guidance and focus for policies and development plans but rather lacking quantifiable targets.
Structure Plan (UK only)	Gardens are not necessarily mentioned in the policy itself however in the explanatory text, lacking weight in the policy. No set actions identified but instruct Local Plans to identify heritage sites and features to be protected from loss or damage, protect areas of open space and support provision of facilities for tourism to enhance rural economy.
Local Plan	Parks (general) included under leisure and recreation theme, whist heritage under umbrella of historic protection. Focus on promoting sensitive restoration but no inclusion of increase use, greater access and better understanding/education which is the aim of the project.
Social	
Cultural Strategies	Again lack of targets and quantifiable outputs. Cultural strategies at more sub regional level are more specific, regional do tend to be vague and difficult to clarify level of investment and support that would be provided. Often rural sites are overlooked due to emphasis on city regions. No guidance or targets for gardens future are provided. Targets are to be set by Local Authorities as part of own cultural strategies, no stringent requirements to do this and leaves variation between authorities.
Heritage Strategy	Whilst includes reference to managing historic parks and gardens, tends to suggest aim is to protect rather than enhance and very traditional focus. No monition of enticing new user groups and greater investment.
Economic	
Regional Economic Strategy	Strong focus on quantifiable targets possibly to the detriment of qualitative outputs from gardens. Strategy does not directly support parks and gardens but does strongly support implementation of the rural recovery plan, cultural and tourism strategies which all identify gardens as a major theme to promote. Large skill focus and again focus on city regions remains strong. Supports large scale projects which enhance regional image, lack of support for smaller sized schemes.
Tourism Strategy	General focus on smaller schemes and objectives which includes dedicated focus on countryside, culture heritage and the landscape.

Specific policies	
Gardens papers	Very clear focus, expected due to nature of document. Generates a lot of ideas and new themes with associated projects but no clear guidance on funding provided. Good attempt but unlikely to impact on gardens in region as too reliant on appropriate funding measures in place.

APPENDIX 4: SWOT ANALYSIS

SWOT: Parks and Gardens and Innovative Regional Development

PARKS AND GARDENS POLICY TOOLS

Strengths:	Weaknesses:
• Widely accepted as valuable and worth to be maintained • Positive image factor • Spatial thinking and opportunities for linking investment strategies with planning policy is becoming more recognised and being adopted. • Parks and gardens being adopted as feature in cultural and tourism strategies.	• Limited/No recognition of spatial planning in general but especially from those producing cultural, tourism and economic strategies. • Stakeholders underrepresented in policy and planning • Difficult to influence high level strategic planning policy and Legislation. • Parks and Gardens still lack endorsement in traditional planning policies aside from natural conservation protection. • Gap developed between the encouragement of high profile investment opportunities e.g. business parks and high profile city centre developments; and protection of areas of greenspace. • Greenspace is yet to feature as an important consideration in the development of a high investment opportunity. • Strategies associated to funding streams e.g. Cultural and Economic Strategies are limited to prioritising ideas/projects as dictated by regional and national strategies – little room to vary from these chosen topics, so difficult at local level to get more variety and choice in projects. • Gardens cannot be measured easily economically. As economic strategies support projects/ideas that have quantitative indicators of performance success it is hard to get gardens included as a topic in the strategy. • Lack of co-ordination between planning policies and teams that produce them, and other associations and documents e.g. development agencies, cultural organisations, tourism boards.

Opportunities:	Threats:
• New quality features as installations, events, arts, interpretation, visitor welcome add to regional strategies and agendas • Inclusion in public transport networks, cycling networks etc. can be improved • Contributing to the soft infrastructure, which is a locational factor of increasing relevance • Quality environment and good landscapes recently recognised by government and will provide spin-offs into planning policy. • Spatial planning is the new focus of UK planning system. • Associated funding and investment from this (public realm, soft infrastructure, and culture) will be available to be harnessed more in future. • Opportunity to have greater influence over policies through new planning system which should breakdown traditional planning focus and embrace spatial planning.	• Continuous support by politicians is essential to unlock potentials for the future and with changing political leadership no guarantee that support will be maintained. • Potentials for economic development still underestimated • As gardens do not produce much measurable economic output difficult to compete for funding support with high profile investment opportunities. • Missing network to lobby in planning processes at the national and international level • Rapidly changing planning system becoming even more complex and even more multilayered – policies are out of date quicker than ever before as focus changes over very short timescale. • With more complex policy hierarchy difficult to know which tier to influence and lack of co-ordination between tiers of policy means that garden influence may not spread through rest of policies. • Projects of regional value which provide great economic spin-offs are favoured in policies, and gardens are not seen as economic improver. • Economy versus environment – economy usually wins • Policies maximising built development, economic strategies/development briefs and investment plans are politically driven, and the fashion is to build rather than conserve, often with no regard to public realm, soft infrastructure etc. • New Planning policies - generally consult traditional parties/bodies associated with planning, those in garden activities not consulted, so difficult to identify opportunities to influence new policy.

APPENDIX 5:KEY ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

Key Issues and problems	Source
Social	
Parks and gardens not clearly mentioned as important heritage assets.	
Seen as cultural features but as part of nature conservation feature requiring protection	Structure and Local plans
Culture and tourism strategies require regional support especially from development agencies. Without this support, the financial support and impact that Cultural Strategies has is limited.	Regional Cultural Strategy and Tourism Strategy
Cross sector marketing is essential	Regional Cultural and Tourism Strategy
Inclusion in public transport network to gardens needs great improvement – will act as a barrier.	
Environmental	
Gap developed between encouragement of business development opportunities and protection of greenspaces	Planning Policies
Economy versus environment. Economy usually wins. Fashion is to build rather than conserve, especially if there is significant economic gain.	
Economic	
Parks and gardens not understood as economic factor	Regional Economic Strategies
Clear need for precise and positive vision to stimulate planning and investment	Garden specific policies and economic strategies
Increasing demand in society for impact assessments, which increasingly includes cultural assets. No established list for indicators and methods of forecasts. Quantifiable targets.	Regional Economic Strategy
Strategies associated with funding streams limited to prioritising projects dictated by regional and national aims.	Regional Economic Strategies Sub regional economic strategy
Gardens cannot be easily measured economically which makes them hard to get included as topics in strategies	Regional Economic Strategy.
Support directly reliant on unstable political priorities.	
Planning issues	
Stakeholders underrepresented in policy and planning	Regional Planning Guidance Structure Plan
Parks and gardens still lack endorsement in traditional planning policies aside from nature conservation protection	Regional Planning Guidance Structure Plan Local Plan
Complex policy hierarchy and a lack of co-ordination restrict the influence that gardens can achieve.	

(source – summary of policy review and SWOT analysis)

APPENDIX 6: SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES

Spatial Policy Objectives	SA Objectives
1. Develop the value, importance and contribution of heritage assets	A Protect, enhance and manage the region's rich diversity of cultural and built environmental assets
2. Enhance the socio economic importance of parks, gardens and open spaces	B Economy in the use of land and buildings C Deliver rural renaissance
3. Raise the profile of cultural importance in regional development	C Deliver rural renaissance A Protect, enhance and manage the region's rich diversity of cultural and built environmental assets
4. Enhance regions natural landscape	E Restore and protect land and soil F Increase the regional tree cover and ensure sustainable management of existing woodland G Protect and enhance the biodiversity, local character and accessibility of the landscape across the region
5. Encourage greater access and engagement in gardens, parks and open spaces	H Secure economic inclusion I Raise public awareness of issues and solutions through education for sustainable development
6. Expand use of gardens beyond nature conservation interests: for tourism, recreation, business development and health	J Develop and maintain a healthy labour market K Exploit the growth potential of business sectors
7. Encourage cross sector marketing of garden heritage assets between different sectors e.g. culture and tourism	L Mainstream sustainable development and integrate activities across the region M Develop and market the region's image
8. Improve public access to garden heritage assets including improvements to public transport network	N Develop the strategic transport, communications and economic infrastructure O Improve choice and use of sustainable transport modes
9. Ensure new development positively promotes greenspaces to address the gap between built development and greenspace enhancement	B Economy in the use of land and buildings M Develop and market the region's image P Improve the competitiveness and productivity of businesses
10. Formation of new conservation priorities in plans for previously developed sites such as old traditional industries, Brownfield sites	B Economy in the use of land and buildings E Restore and protect land and soil
11. Encourage adoption of garden economic impact assessment to support enhancement of greenspace in new development and regeneration	N Develop the strategic transport, communications and economic infrastructure H Secure economic inclusion
12. Development of quantitative indicators and targets for garden asset assessment, along with monitoring criteria for easy economic assessment	Q Active management of resources K Exploit the growth potential of business sectors D Deliver urban renaissance
13. Formation of positive cross sector vision for the future of garden assets to be adopted by all sectors and introduced to policy documents	L Mainstream sustainable development and integrate activities across the region M Develop and market the region's image
14. Formation of new strategic spatial garden body to lobby government for inclusion of gardens in future priorities	L Mainstream sustainable development and integrate activities across the region
15. Formation of observatory for garden heritage assets involving stakeholders from traditional and on traditional garden bodies, planning bodies and other	I Raise public awareness of issues and solutions through education for sustainable development A Protect, enhance and manage the region's

associated organisations	rich diversity of cultural and built environmental assets
16. Ensure gardens are included as a priority in the formation and review of new policy documents, by encouraging consultations with the new spatial garden body on issues and new policy formation	L Mainstream sustainable development and integrate activities across the region
17. Ensure better educational tools for gardens, and greater understanding of garden heritage	I Raise public awareness of issues and solutions through education for sustainable development R Develop and exploit the region's knowledge base J Develop and maintain a healthy labour market S Improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employment
18. Ensure rural sites are given equal weight and priority to redress the balance between rural, suburb and city regions	C Deliver rural renaissance
19. Ensure greater guidance and clarification on future economic priorities to provide opportunities for garden investment	H Secure economic inclusion
20. Formation of regional targets for garden heritage development based on quantifiable criteria to feed into regional economic strategies	H Secure economic inclusion L Mainstream sustainable development and integrate activities across the region
21. Ensure clear targets are set for enticing greater user groups to the gardens	I Raise public awareness of issues and solutions through education for sustainable development
22. Ensure qualitative targets for gardens and supported by future policy formation	A Protect, enhance and manage the region's rich diversity of cultural and built environmental assets

APPENDIX 7: POLICY COMPATIBILITY MATRIX

SA Objectives	Garden policy objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
A	Protect, enhance and manage the Region's rich diversity of cultural and built environmental assets	++	D	+	?	D	D	+		D	D	+		+	+	+	+	D	D		+	+	+
B	Economy in the use of land and buildings		D		_			?	?	_	_	?		D		?	?		D	+	?	?	+
C	Deliver rural renaissance	D	D	?	?	+	+	+	+	D	?	?	+	D		?	+	?	++	?			
D	Deliver urban renaissance	D	D	D	?	?	D	?	?	D	?	?	+	D		?	+			+	+		
E	Restore and protect land and soil	+	?	?	+		_		?	_	+	D	?	D	+				?	?			
F	Increase the regional tree cover and ensure sustainable management of existing woodland	D	D		+	D	D		D	+	?			D	?	?	D		D	?			
G	Protect and enhance the biodiversity, local character and accessibility of the landscape across the region	D	?		+	++	D	D	++	+	D	?			D	+	+		+	?	?		
H	Secure economic inclusion		+	D	?		D		?	?	?	+	D		D	D	D		?	+	+	D	D
I	Raise public awareness of issues and solutions through education for sustainable development	+		?		+	+	D	+	D	D	D	?	?	D	D	D	+	D	?		+	
J	Develop and maintain a healthy labour market		+	+	?	?	+	+	?			+	+	D	D	D	+	?	D	D	+		+
K	Exploit the growth potential of business sectors	?	+	+	_	?	+	D	?	D	D	D	+	D	D	D	D		D	+	+		+
L	Mainstream sustainable development and integrate activities across the region	+	+	+	D	+	++	++	D	D	D	+	?	++	+	+	+	?	D	+	+	+	+

SA Objectives	**Garden policy objectives**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
M	Develop and market the region's image	++	D	+	++	D	+	++	D	+	D	D	D	+	+	++	++	D		+	+	+	+
N	Develop the strategic transport, communications and economic infrastructure					+	D		+	D	D			D	D	D	D			+	+		+
O	Improve choice and use of sustainable transport modes				D	+	+	D	++					D	D	D	+			+		+	
P	Improve the competitiveness and productivity of businesses	+	+	+			+	+		+	D	D		D	+	+	+		D	+	+	+	+
Q	Active management of resources	+	+	+	++	+	+	D	D	+	D	D	?	D	D	+	+		D	+	+		D
R	Develop and exploit the region's knowledge base			+			+			?		D		D	D	D	D	+		D	+		+
S	Improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employment	+		+		+	+	+	+	+	D	D	D	+	+	+	+	++		D	D	D	D

APPENDIX 8: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Garden Policy Objective	Recommendation
1. Develop the value, importance and contribution of heritage assets	Careful planning and management is required here to ensure that future economic development principles compliment careful management of heritage assets
2. Enhance the socio economic importance of parks, gardens and open spaces	Careful thought into how the objective is managed and promoted is required, need for this objective to be incorporated into the economic strategies and designed to reflect recognition of value of gardens in economic prosperity.
3. Raise the profile of cultural importance in regional development	Inclusion of cultural promotion in economic strategies and ensure that policies are strongly cultural orientated in new development and new strategies.
4. Enhance regions natural landscape	Add to wording of the objective to ensure proactive enhancement of natural landscape in line with economic strategy.
5. Encourage greater access and engagement in gardens, parks and open spaces	Possibly need to strengthen the policy to show the positive economic impact on a region, for tourism and inward investment resulting from greater access to open space.
6. Expand use of gardens beyond nature conservation interests:- for tourism, recreation, business development and health.	Expand the objective to include the use of more economic focused terms, specifically mention what uses should be encouraged including tourism, investment regeneration and cultural. Make objective use criteria recognised by RES and other strategic documents.
7. Encourage cross sector marketing of garden heritage assets between different sectors e.g. culture and tourism	Tailor the objective to outline exactly what these measures should achieve in specific detail
8. Improve public access to garden heritage assets including improvements to public transport network	Amend the wording to provide for greater scope for sustainable access which is environmentally sensitive, provide an emphasis on encouraging access to sites which can provide important local economic gain and support local businesses. Ensure there is scope for this in the objective and the objective needs to stress the importance of including access for important groups that have previously been discounted and neglected, as well as encouraging general greater access to gardens.

9. Ensure new development positively promotes greenspaces to address the gap between built development and greenspace enhancement.	Amend the wording of the text to provide for a firm stance on not only protecting existing greenspace, gardens and parks, but to ensure that new development encourages the maintenance and development of more greenspace assets. This should particularly be the case for new regeneration of area lacking greenspace and development around existing heritage assets. Ensure a firm approach in wording to provide a focus of protect and provide, rather than just the general strategy which is adopted at present. Ensure the policy reflects the general requirements of the economic strategies fuelling new development and regeneration.
10. Formation of new conservation priorities in plans for previously developed sites such as old traditional industries, Brownfield sites.	Firm up wording to ensure that it is clear where the priorities should be included.
11. Encourage adoption of garden economic impact assessment to support enhancement of greenspace in new development and regeneration.	Consider broadening the wording of this objective to provide for economic appraisals where they would provide an opportunity to protect or enhance the garden heritage asset**.**
12. Development of quantitative indicators and targets for garden asset assessment, along with monitoring criteria for easy economic assessment.	More consideration is given to the detail of this objective. Put in tighter restrictions on what the remit of these quantitative indicators would be and define a purpose for the indicators and targets.
13. Formation of positive cross sector vision for the future of garden assets to be adopted by all sectors and introduced to policy documents	This objective is consistent with other sustainable development criteria, and reflects the general approach being taken at a sub regional level by bodies associated with gardens. Amend the text to include formation of and 'consistent support for' to ensure that this is a continued exercise taken on board for the medium to long term to provide a means of influencing policy development and informing new guidance in relation to emerging policies of a strategic nature.
14. Formation of new strategic spatial garden body to lobby government for inclusion of gardens in future priorities	Objective should be retained but should also be expanded to provide clarification on where this garden body would fit into the policy formation hierarchy and what function this garden body would take.
15. Formation of observatory for garden heritage assets involving stakeholders from traditional and non traditional garden bodies, planning bodies and other associated organisations.	That this objective be removed as this function will be performed by another

16. Ensure gardens are included as a priority in the formation and review of new policy documents, by encouraging consultations with the new spatial garden body on issues and new policy formation.	This objective should be retained and strengthened in the wording of the text.
17. Ensure better educational tools for gardens, and greater understanding of garden heritage	Objective to be retained in its current form.
18. Ensure rural sites are given equal weight and priority to redress the balance between rural, suburb and city regions	Policy be strengthened in the text to ensure that rural garden sites' are highlighted in particular, not just rural sites as a whole.
19. Ensure greater guidance and clarification on future economic priorities to provide opportunities for garden investment	Objective should be retained in its current form.
20. Formation of regional targets for garden heritage development based on quantifiable criteria to feed into regional economic strategies.	Wording of the objective be tightened to ensure that there is greater guidance on what regional targets would be developed and provide clarity on the outcomes to be achieved. Suggested that the targets reflect the indicators set out in the regional economic strategy or similar, to provide continuity and clear relationships between the objective and the regional strategies.
21. Ensure clear targets are set for enticing greater user groups to the gardens	Wording of the objective be amended to reflect the need for greater clarification on where these targets would be used. Amend wording to include 'set targets, linked to the RES and development plans' for enticing greater users groups to the gardens, and use as a basis for quantifiable monitoring'.
22. Ensure qualitative targets for gardens are supported by future policy formation.	Objective is expanded to include 'through on going lobbying of policy makers, government bodies and other relevant organisations'.

August 2006

This study and toolkit has been developed by

Emma Williams (Cheshire County Council)

within Action 1 "Spatial Strategy"
of the INTERREG IIIB NWE Project
European Garden Heritage Network

This project has received European Regional Development Funding through the INTERREG III B Community Initiative